DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 073 CE 001 126

AUTHOR Worthington, Robert M.
TITLE Redirecting Guidance and Counseling: A Top Priority for Career Education.
PUB DATE 17 Feb 72
NOTE 11p.; Keynote Address at the Stout State University 21st Annual Guidance Conference, Menomonie, Wisconsin, February 17, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; Career Planning; Continuous Learning; Counseling; *Counseling Goals; Counselor Role; Decision Making; *Decision Making Skills; Goal Orientation; *Government Role; Guidance; Guidance Objectives; Pilot Projects; *Relevance (Education); Research; School Role; Speeches; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Since it is a lifelong system increasing the relevancy of basic academic subjects, stressing decision-making, and assuring everyone a marketable skill, the Office of Education believes that career education has potential for effecting a complete renewal of education. The Office has: (1) launched six pilot community projects; (2) asked each State to plan a model (school-, home-, or employer-based, or rural residential) with Federal funds; (3) appointed an investigative panel of scholars; and (4) contracted for a project with the University of Missouri to help States organize and conduct implementation workshops in career development guidance and counseling. A career education thrust requires top priority for redirecting and expanding guidance, counseling, and placement; a Bureau-produced catalog of areas of "national concern" suggesting the scope of attention and responsibilities involved in a systematic redirection is reinforced by Eli Ginzberg's critique of career guidance ("Few spend...significant time in activities designed to lead to improved decision-making"). A comprehensive and developmental program must be designed for outcomes that ensure freedom of choice for American citizens. (AJ)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 089073

REDIRECTING GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING: A TOP PRIORITY FOR CAREER EDUCATION*

BY DR. ROBERT M. WORTHINGTON
ASSOCIATE U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF ADULT, VOCATION AND
TECHNICAL EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

* Keynote Address at the Stout State University 21st Annual Guidance Conference, Menomonie, Wisconsin, February 17, 1972

Reprinted for the Indiana Conference on Career Education and Career Development by permission of Associate Commissioner, Dr. Robert M. Worthington

CE001 126

REDIRECTING GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING: A TOP PRIORITY FOR CAREER EDUCATION

An Address by Robert M. Worthington
Associate Commissioner
Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

> There is no more disconcerting waste than the waste of human potential. And there is no better investment than an investment in human fulfillment. Career Education can help make education and training more meaningful for the student, more rewarding for the teacher, more available to the adult, more relevant for the disadvantaged, and more productive for our country.

President Nixon used those words in his State of the Union message just a few short weeks ago. And here at Stout State University, today, are some 2,000 or more of you--diversified educators and counselors--assembled to confer on the myriad aspects of "Improving Relevance through Career Education."

Obviously, Stout's President William Micheels, Vice President Ralph Iverson, the Guidance Conference planning committee, and all of you did not just start thinking about career education and its interrelationship with guidance. As a matter of fact, we in the U.S. Office of Education, through a contractual arrangement with the University of Missouri, recently capitalized upon the pioneering work of Wisconsin State and local education agencies in producing the state-wide K-12 Guide for Integrating Career Development into Local Curriculum. State Superintendent William C. Kahl, former state guidance consultant Harry N. Drier, and others from Wisconsin played key roles in a National Leadership Training Conference for Career Development Guidance, Counseling and Placement in St. Louis early this January.

As Commissioner Marland has indicated in all of his presentations on career education, neither he nor the U.S. Office of Education invented the idea--career education--nor are all of the initiatives on its behalf coming out of Washington. In many instances, the support of Chief State School Officers for Federal initiatives is really an extension of convictions and actions already in use in state and local educational systems and in professional activities such as your conference here today. The Commissioner, for example, told the Pennsylvania Personnel and Guidance Association Conference last November:

> My meeting with the Chief State School Officers (June 1971) was a high point in my first year as Commissioner of Education. . . . They endorsed the career education concept to a man. To a man they were willing to pledge the resources of their offices and their personal powers of persuasion as we attempt to hammer out the evolving definition and design of this large idea. To a man they assured me that career education is not just another education fad; this is a concept, they held, that must be advanced, and that all schools and their communities must have a hand in the process.

Let us also consider these national statistics for the 1970-71 school year. Of 3.7 million young people leaving formal education in 1970-71, nearly 2.5 million lacked skills adequate to enter the labor force at a level commensurate with their academic and intellectual promise. Many left with no marketable skill whatsoever.

-- 850,000 dropped out of elementary or secondary school during the year. Let's assume on the average they left at the end of the 10th grade. At $8,000 per child to get them that far, the total cost to the Nation can be estimated at about $9 billion.

-- 750,000 graduated from the high school general curriculum with little or nothing to offer prospective employers. At $12,000 per student, total cost to the Nation would be $9 billion.

-- 850,000 entered college but left without a degree or completion of an organized occupational program. Let's assume, that on the average, they left at the end of the first college year, which added $3,000 to the $12,000 per pupil outlay through high school. The total cost to the Nation can be estimated at $12 billion.

These three groups of youngsters then represent a combined outlay of nearly $28 billion--about one-third of the entire amount spent on education in this country last year. We spend billions to prepare 2.5 million young people for potential disenchantment, aimlessness and failure, year after year after year!

And I am sure that we all agree with Commissioner Marland that "even more distressing are the losses we cannot calculate in dollars--the loss of confidence and self-esteem, the sense of alienation and drift, the terrible sense of abasement and nonfulfillment that burdens millions of young people as they embark upon their adult lives. The aftermath of these early defections, of course, usually turns up in our unemployment, welfare, and crime statistics."

Such facts can satisfy neither our citizens' pocketbooks nor their consciences--nor our own.

Yes, education must be made more relevant--and more human. Students themselves tell us this, as do many prominent educators and businessmen. Jerome Bruner, for example, has recently suggested that we need to de-emphasize the structure of knowledge in favor of dealing with knowledge in the context of problems that face us. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has just issued a formal statement of policy on education--in support of the broad concept of career education. Both from within and without the education profession, therefore, the potential of the career education theme for effecting a complete renewal of education in our country is gaining almost universal affirmation.

What is "career education"--precisely? It is an evolving concept--broad and complex in many respects, straightforward and concrete in others. Right now, we must solicit each other's ideas, insight and support--as indeed this Stout State University Guidance Conference is expressly organized to do--so that every positive initiative may be undertaken and sustained at all levels of education.

Career education is a system of life-long education from the cradle to the grave. The system has five levels. The first level is the level of career awareness from kindergarten through the sixth grade level. The second level is occupational information and career exploration ranging from grades seven to ten. The third level is job placement and specialized career education extending from the tenth through the twelfth or fourteenth years of schooling. The fourth level is specific occupational preparation at the post-secondary level. The fifth and final level is adult and continuing education. It trains or retrains adults who need to upgrade their skills.

Career education would provide the training students require for success and at the same time give them the education they need to bring personal fulfillment into their lives. It would teach reading, writing and arithmetic as the fundamental skills. It would at the same time stress the ability to think, decide, and judge. The general curriculum, as it now stands in most schools, possesses neither the practicality of vocational courses nor the quality of college-preparatory offerings. What we propose in career education is to make the basic academic subjects much more relevant for the student in relationship to his future goals.

Career education is not another name for vocational education, nor for occupational training: but it should accord to its occupational training components the same prestige, concern, and recognition as the college preparatory curriculum. It is not a form of education only for disadvantaged or for "not-college-material" students; it is for all students--in varying degrees and forms according to their maturity and interests--but for

everyone. It is not limited to preparation for, and advancement in gainful employment; but it should assure that every young man and woman, no matter where he or she leaves the educational system, will possess a marketable job skill, at any age, at any time.

Career education, in this context, indeed has many implications for those who provide counseling and guidance services. Certainly of major relevance to career education is the entire subject of the goals for career choice in career guidance and the process of career choice.

Career education is not designed to dictate career choices. Rather, the goals of career choice lie in its process, not in its end results. It is not what the individual chooses that concerns us. Rather, it is that he chooses which is important. It is the reality of choice rather than the realism of choice that is our primary concern. The wisdom of the basis on which individual choices are made is much more germane to evaluating effectiveness of career guidance than any judgments regarding the supposed "wisdom" of the choices that are made.

Given bonafide choices and adequate assistance in the decision making process, we have no doubt but what most individuals will choose in ways beneficial both to themselves and to society in general. This belief, like our belief in individual freedom, is absolute and without limits.

Lest misunderstanding result here, let me hasten to add that freedom to choose demands, as a prerequisite, that real choices be present. The term "choice" when applied to various alternatives implies that there is no automatic nor universal social ordering of such alternatives from "best" to "worst." Rather, it implies that the ordering of alternatives will be an individual matter--that the "best choice" for one individual may be the "worst choice" for another.

That is what motivates many of us to work for the concept of career education. We do not fight for career education but rather to make it possible for individuals to choose knowledgeably from among all the careers available to them.

The wisdom of the career choice decision is to be found in the ways in which the individual is able to gather accurate data regarding each of three important questions. These must be resolved by the individual in making a career decision. The first of these is, "What is important to me?" A second essential question is, "What is possible for me?" The third, and final, question in the career decision making process is, "What is probable for me?" We must find the ways in which he is able to combine such data with his own personal value system so that he can answer each question for himself and the ways in which he is able to devise and construct meaningful relationship among answers given to all three questions in ways that will lead him

toward a reasoned career choice. Career education would reinforce this process of career choice.

We in the Office of Education are demonstrating our faith in this career education concept with some concentrated work and funds; specifically, we have launched six pilot projects in communities that represent a cross-section of socio-economic populations. School systems in these six districts had already been moving toward career education on their own or with state help. They are located in Mesa, Arizona; Atlanta; Jefferson County, Colorado; Pontiac, Michigan; and Hackensack, New Jersey. And, as of last fall, I have asked each state to initiate the planning of at least one intra-state model this year with Federal funds.

The first of these designs, the school-based model, calls for the restructuring of our elementary and secondary curricula to familiarize youngsters with basic information about occupations in the primary grades, to help them get exposure to real work situations in the middle years, and to prepare them in senior high school either to enter their chosen field with a marketable skill upon graduation if not sooner, or continue on for technical or professional training at the college level. This model eliminates the general high school curriculum altogether. Instead, it builds a career orientation into the basic academic subjects all along the line, and helps every youngster learn about the many career choices available in such fields as manufacturing, marketing, health sciences, communications, public service, the professions and the trades. It provides for improved and extended guidance, counseling, and placement functions all along the line as well. And it gives every young person the necessary preparation to earn a living in a field he selects well before he or she leaves the educational system.

In addition to the school-based model, there are three other career education models. One is employer-based, providing a structure in which industrial firms, businesses, and government agencies will be able to operate work-training programs related to their own employment needs for students still in school as well as for dropouts. Clearly this is an alternative to conventional school. But there must also be extensive provisions for effective guidance, counseling, and placement functions in this model too.

Another, the home-based model, will, among other devices, use TV and correspondence courses to bring undereducated adults back into the mainstream of formal education or to help them get better jobs than they presently have. The last of the four is called the rural-residential model; its first site is a former Air Force base near Glasgow, Montana, where entire families will live and train together for new and upgraded employment. This site serves six largely rural states.

But it is obvious that the realization of career education cannot be achieved solely as a result of Federal funds or U.S.O.E. initiatives. Our actions must be catalytic in a reaction taking place throughout the nation.

On February 7, a Panel of Scholars on Career Education, appointed by Commissioner Marland, met with him and key staff in the U.S. Office of Education to consider together their appropriate contributions to the emerging concept of career education in their own scholarly field. Invited to serve on this panel, I am sure all of you participating in this Guidance Conference will be pleased to know, are President William Micheels of Stout State and Mrs. Thelma Daley, president of the American School Counselors Association.

The purpose of this ad hoc panel is for scholars and practitioners in various disciplines--for example, an attorney, an economist, a sociologist, an anthropologist, a labor organization specialist and others outstanding in their fields of knowledge--to serve as investigators--"critics," if you will--and contributors to the concept of career education from their own scholarly or practical perspective.

Another effort which I have initiated included, as a first step, last month's National Leadership Training Conference in St. Louis, to which I alluded earlier. The overall project under contract with the University of Missouri at Columbia is entitled, Cooperative State Implementation Workshops for Career Development Guidance, Counseling, and Placement. It is designed to provide leadership and technical assistance to the states to help them formulate and implement the career development guidance, counseling, and placement functions which will be crucial to the planning and realization of the total career education thrust. This new contract project will carry through to implementation of the goals, concepts, and principles originally recommended by a coordinated series of national and regional conferences on "guidance, counseling, and placement in career development and educational-occupational decision making." I am confident that some of you participated in either the October 1969 national conference or in one of the conferences held in each HEW region the following year. The contract now in progress is designed to encourage and assist each state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in organizing and conducting an implementation workshop. The purpose of each state workshop, which is expected to take place late this spring or in the summer, is for state personnel to develop--or to improve any existing--home-school-community model for implementing career development guidance, counseling, and placement in their respective local school districts.

While it is clear that a national movement to improve and expand career guidance, counseling, and placement is substantially underway--and now gaining impetus rapidly--it is of paramount

importance that all of us think carefully about what we would redirect our sights, our talents, and the public's resources towards--and why. The guidance, counseling, and placement functions, their practitioners, and the practitioners' teachers--like most of the rest of us in education--have, as you all well know, been receiving "their lumps," too.

It is helpful, as one kind of approach to examining needed redirection, to take a systematic look at what nationally influential groups and spokesmen have been saying about, and expecting of, career guidance, counseling, and placement in recent years. Such an approach was taken about a year ago by appropriate Bureau program staff and advisers (Bottoms, Gysbers, and Pritchard--December 1970). They researched this question by identifying and analyzing dozens of source documents bearing on the subject. They then synthesized from their findings a catalog of areas of "national concern" about career guidance, counseling, and placement. The 28 areas of national expressed concerns (which I will not take the time to read to you) were grouped in 5 broad categories. These I will list for you because, among other things, they suggest the scope of attention and responsibilities which must be involved in a systematic redirection. The 5 broad categories are: Direct Service Functions, Management and Support Functions, Media and Methods, Staff Development and Target Population Groups (in general and in particular). The authors closed their report with this statement:

> The authors would impress upon the reader the essential unity of the message which these many different sources, over a substantial period of time, have been conveying to the interested public, the government, and us professionals. It is also crystal clear that this message strikes far beyond the professional-technical repertoire, priorities, and attitudes of the direct service teacher and counselor, which are, of course, included, to the highest levels of legislative, policy and planning, and management attention.

A critique currently receiving much attention is Eli Ginzberg's Career Guidance: Who Needs It, Who Provides It, Who Can Improve It? Many of its criticisms and recommendations are similar to, and therefore reinforce, those made by other "nationally influential groups and spokesmen" as identified in the report described above. Ginsberg, too, acknowledges that the career guidance functions have been restricted by "manpower, money, and other constraints." He, also, reports that "counselors appear to spend the bulk of their time in approving courses of study, in assisting with college applications, in dealing with rule infractions and test administration. Few spend a significant amount of time in activities designed to lead to improved decision making and long-range planning." He charges that "guidance, like education, has been caught up in its own rhetoric for so long that it balks at anything less than remaking man and society."

Ginzberg offers many specific recommendations, a number of which are already widely accepted in principle, if not yet in operation and they are integral to the career education and guidance modeling already underway, including the 1969-to-present coordinated series of national and regional conferences and state implementation workshops on career development guidance, counseling, and placement previously described to you. A few specific examples are minorities and women as emphasized "target populations," team work by counselors and teachers, closer working with resource persons and agencies outside the school, revision of counselor (and teacher) education to include, among other improvements, more field work and training in the dynamics of the labor market, and modification of counselor and teacher certification standards.

But at least one of Ginzberg's major recommendations--for guidance leaders to take a public stand against the use of counselors in elementary schools--is antithetical to a career development approach, kindergarten through adulthood for the guidance, counseling and placement functions. Ginzberg's explanation for his stand, astonishingly, is that "properly trained guidance counselors primarily concerned with career development (underlining supplied) have little to contribute to the elementary school." Perhaps his view is attributable to a connotation of "career" much more limited than the one our own efforts employ, or to a continuing narrow rather than expanding conception of counselor responsibility, or to both.

This kind of conflict, in any event, illustrates the basic need expressed before, for all of us in guidance and counseling to think carefully about the directions we may take--and why: about our implicit assumptions, the substance of our understandings, and the effective communication achieved with others.

Actually, a good deal of forward-looking work in career guidance and counseling has been going on for a number of years now. Unfortunately, this is not generally well-known by educators and is even less well-known by non-educators. This is not to say--and I emphasize it--that the generally criticized conditions have been substantially resolved in many places. But it is to say that we in education are a long way from scratch in identifying directions and developing means for progress. Here are just a few observations in support of this statement:

In relation to vocational education, it is a fact that the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 have been giving continuing impetus, leadership and support to a wide range of state and national conferences, seminars and workshops. Some of the national ones not already mentioned in this address include a conference on "Implementing Career Development Theory and Research Through the Curriculum," a "National Seminar on Vocational Guidance," a conference on "Occupational Information in Vocational Guidance," and a

conference on "Vocational Aspects of Counselor Education." These are cited to you because useful reports of recommendations and guidelines resulted from them, they have been significantly affecting career guidance in education, and they are available to all for help in redirecting guidance and counseling for career development.

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education proposes to issue a special report on guidance, counseling, and placement this spring. For several months now a special council sub-committee on guidance has been collating pertinent materials, conferring with national leaders of guidance, U.S.O.E. officials, and other concerned groups, and soliciting position papers in preparation for this report. Just last week the sub-committee met with representatives of guidance "consumer" groups to obtain their views. A special report of recommended priorities and policies from this presidentially appointed council can have great impact on public policy and support for career development guidance, counseling, and placement.

And not to be overlooked are the substantial new provisions for guidance and counseling incorporated in educational legislation currently pending further action in the Congress.

At this juncture, the major national need has substantially shifted from portrayals of "what is wrong with guidance" to the need for sound delineations of "what will be right with guidance" --and, therefore, of "what guidance" justifies in terms of increasing solid support in public policy and allocation of resources.

A comprehensive and integrated developmental program of career guidance, counseling, and placement--responsive to the needs of all in-school youth, and also to the needs of youth and adults already in the job market who need further education or training--must be designed for such outcomes as the following:

First, identification of, and prompt attention to, the career development needs, characteristics, and circumstances of all students, at all educational levels, with an increasing proportion of attention given to the disadvantaged and handicapped;

Second, developmental programs of self and career orientation and information beginning in kindergarten through post-secondary and adult for all students;

Third, systematic and sequential activities by the total school at all levels to facilitate the educational-occupational decision making of all students taking into consideration their age and maturity;

Fourth, job placement programs that assist each student to gain employment and to satisfactorily hold a job;

Fifth, an outreach function aimed at youth outside the school system and designed to help them to return to an appropriate learning situation or to part-time training and related employment; and

Finally, follow through and linkage assistance, including job adjustment counseling.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize once again my strong convictions regarding the process of career choice and career development.

Career development is essentially a life-long process, beginning early in the pre-school years and continuing, for most individuals, through retirement. As a process, it includes the view one has of himself as a worker, the view he has of work itself, the knowledge he acquires about himself and his possible work opportunities, the choices he makes related to himself as a worker, and the ways in which he implements those choices. Programs of career development concern themselves with each of these facets of the total process.

Personal choices involved in career development are taking place on a continuing basis throughout the life of the individual. Choices involving personal life styles, personal values, and leisure time preferences are as much a part of career development as are occupational choices.

The freedom to choose occupations is among the most treasured of all those promised American citizens. This freedom to choose, theoretically, is without limit. It extends even to the freedom to choose not to choose. It is predicated on the assumption that, given such freedom, most individuals will choose in ways which, in the long run, will not only bring satisfaction to themselves but also maximum contributions to society.

To express a commitment to a philosophy of freedom to choose in no way guarantees that such freedom will, for a given individual, be present. There can be no freedom of occupational choice for those who have never learned <u>how</u> to make occupational decisions. One cannot choose from among opportunities unless he <u>knows</u> what those opportunities are. In addition to knowledge, <u>understanding</u> is also an essential element in the making of decisions. Even the best of decisions benefits the individual little if he has no concrete ways of <u>implementing</u> the decisions he has made. How can we speak about freedom of occupational choice unless the individual is given opportunity to understand <u>himself</u> as well as the variety of options open to him?

A career education thrust in American education simultaneously demands and promises top priority for redirecting and expanding guidance, counseling, and placement; all of us can help achieve this priority because career development will operate at every level and in every setting represented in career education.